

36613, 6', which recently has been edited by Sachs 1977, pp. 144–147, too<sup>31</sup>. The Graeco-Roman evidence in any case is amply confirmed by these data.

3.5. Of special relevance and invaluable historical significance is, however, what we read on the fragments of the astronomical diary for 333/2 B.C., which is labelled LBAT 193 + 194, in line obv. 1 and in the colophons: *ṁār-ta-šā-ta šā ṁda-ri-ia-a-muš LUGAL MU-šū [na-bu-ú]* "Artašata called Dariyamuš the king" (though always only in part). Here one discovers an unquestionable testimony for Darius' change of name and at the same time for his birth name, which appears moreover in a form not compatible with Iustinus' *Codomannus* (cfr. § 2.6 above). And that original name Artašat of Darius III is ascertained by another text at all, viz. the fragments of a great planetary table containing Jupiter observations for the years 362/1 to 324/3 B.C.<sup>32</sup>: *MU-I-KÁM ṁār-ta-šā-a-tú* "1st year of Artašātu" (LBAT 1401, obv. 5') must refer to Darius III and the year 335/4 B.C. These data point categorically to that Darius III originally was not called *Codomannus* as generally is inferred from Iustinus X,3,3–5 (cfr. § 2.6 above), but on the contrary was named Artašat<sup>33</sup>, i.e. OP *\*Rta-šāti-*. With that new evidence the facts fit in very well that the name *Codomannus* attested only in Iustinus is quite isolated, has neither resembling nor comparable names at its side, and has found rather suspicion than an evident etymological interpretation<sup>34</sup>. The name Artašat, however, is known from another Babylonian source, too, in the form of *ṁar-ta-šā-a-ta* (Dar. 476,2.8<sup>35</sup>, that text being a deed from the 18th year of Darius I)

<sup>31</sup> The fragment, which refers to Arsēs as well as to Alexander the Great and which might be from a chronicle text like ABC 9 cited above in § 3.4, contains the phrase *ṁār-šū A šā ṁū-ma-kuš* (not: *ṁū-ma-su*) *šā ṁār-tak-šat-s[u ...]*. It is self-evident that this can mean nothing else than "Aršu, son of Umakuš [called] Artakšats[u the king]"; the speculations considered by Badian 1977, p. 50 (cfr. Dupont-Sommer in Fouilles 1979, p. 166 n. 1) are indefensible.

<sup>32</sup> That holds true only if one agrees to the combination of all the fragments LBAT 1397 + 1401 + BM 46031 + LBAT 1398 proposed by Pinches 1955, p. xxx and Sachs 1977, p. 143.

<sup>33</sup> The first among the historians to notice that fact seemingly was Badian 1977, p. 49 n. 20.

<sup>34</sup> In most recent times Harmatta 1969, p. 204 (which article has been translated to me by Dr. László Kajdi, to whom I am very obliged for that aid) was occupied with the name of *Codomannus*: He traced it back to an Old Iranian or even OP *\*Katu-manah-* "of warlike mind" (containing the noun *\*katu-* "fight", proven for several Iranian languages), though there are some phonological difficulties in the representation of *\*katu-* by Greek *\*Koδo-*, Latin *Codo-*. For other more or less unfounded hypotheses cfr. Justi 1895, p. 502 and Hinz 1979, p. 203 (*\*Gaudamanuš*, but without translation).

<sup>35</sup> For this text and its interpretation see, most recently, Dandamaev 1974, pp. 420 sq. and p. 148.

and can be paralleled moreover with two Elamite forms attested in the Persepolis Fortification Tablets, viz. *Ir-da-ši-ya-ti-iš* and *Ir-da-ša-ti-iš*<sup>36</sup>. The Iranian original forms of these two Elamite names are *\*Rta-šyāti-* and *\*Rta-šāti-* respectively, these being two diachronic or diatopic-dialectal or rather diastratic variants of one and the same name, which may be interpreted as "provided with the happiness of Rta" or sim.<sup>37</sup> For since final short vowels of Late Babylonian forms are notoriously inconclusive, it seems more natural to equal the Babylonian forms cited above with this original, too, than to separate them as reflecting an underlying Old Iranian *\*Rta-š(y)āta-* "happy through Rta" (or sim.), as it is done by Hinz 1975, p. 215 s.v. So one can draw the final conclusion that the original name of king Darius III was an Iranian name attested elsewhere<sup>38</sup> and hence not to be contested. The apparent 'coexistence' of that *\*Rta-šāti-* and Iustinus' *Codomannus* may be settled by assuming, as did Harmatta 1969, p. 204, that *Codomannus* was not a fixed element of his titulature, but a surname given to him for some reason (perhaps because of some heroic deed in his youth like that mentioned by Iustinus and overlooked by Harmatta, loc. cit.), so that in the case of Darius III the surname *Codomannus* is to the original name *\*Rta-šāti-* as is, let us say, *Μνημων*/Latin *Mnemon* "remembering" to *Arsēs* in the case of Artaxerxes II.

4. Although we learn more detailed particulars about that Achaemenid institution such as the question of the date of such a change of name<sup>39</sup> neither from the Graeco-Roman nor from the Babylonian tradition, that new evidence from the Babylonian astronomical texts nevertheless makes it possible to form a more clear judgment in many respects. But first I will give here a comparative survey of the personal names attested in the sources quoted above:

<sup>36</sup> The quotations can best be seen in Hallock 1969, p. 703b s.vv.

<sup>37</sup> Cfr., e.g., Mayrhofer 1973, p. 166 § 8.604 and Hinz 1975, p. 215 s.v.

<sup>38</sup> The difference between the Babylonian and the Elamite forms identified here looks greater than it is in reality, since the one reflect as *-šat/* the Iranian stem-form *\*-šāti-*, whilst the other as *-šatiš/* point to the Iranian nominative form *\*-šātiš*.

<sup>39</sup> Following Herzfeld 1947, p. 93, already Frye 1963, p. 92 pondered on the question, whether these names were "taken at the time of accession, or when named crown prince". In this connexion it should be mentioned, however, that the interpretation of Xerxes' inscription XPK as belonging to Xerxes as crown prince (based on the fact that this text is the only inscription of an Achaemenid king without any title, since it runs: "Xerxes, son of king Darius, an Achaemenid") by Herzfeld 1938, p. 42, if correct, would show that *Xšayāršā* bore his name, which is of the same species as *Dārayavaus* or *\*Rta-xšaça* and therefore also a throne-name, already before his accession (cfr. Herzfeld 1935, p. 83).